| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| In Re Application Of: | Chernyak et al. | Examiner: | Michael D. Masinick |
| Serial No. | 10/686,090 | Group Art Unit: | 212 |
| Filed: | 10/14/2003 | | |
| For: | A Method for Eff.... | Date: | May 5th, 2006 |

OIPE IAP2 MAY 05 2006 PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

## RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

This is in response to the Final Office Action mailed 12/06/2005.

## AFFIRMATION OF ELECTION/RESTRICTIONS

Pursuant to a telephone call with the Office on May 6, 2005 prosecution of this invention was focused on Group I, claims 1-67; and this election is hereby affirmed. All other claims are hereby cancelled.

## CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC §102(e)

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-3, 5-11, 36-37, 40-47 and 63 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0156757 (Brown, et al.). The OA noted that Applicant "has not submitted a specific claim element which is not shown in the Brown patent", nor found Applicant's arguments concerning the proper scope of interpretation to be persuasive.

Applicant has amended Claim 1 specifically to redress this point. Entirely absent from Brown, and central to Applicant's invention, are either or both (a) process-referential information and (b) decision accountability information, concerning the current state of a product and its design. Process-referential and decision accountability information tracks not just a product's design and its realization (that product as it is being manufactured), but also both the decisions and the authorizational warrants for those decisions that created the current state; it is, in that sense, self-referential and self-descriptive. Knowledge of the current state (whether of a design, a particular version of a product, or all versions of designs and product), both as to what that state is and how that state came to be, allows management of the entire process of design and manufacture from